DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 088 HE 003 248

AUTHOR	Shelton, Joe B.
TITLE	A Comparison of Faculty Academic Advising and Academic Advising by Professional Counselors. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Johnson County Community Coll., Shawnee Mission, Kans.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-G-038
PUB DATE	Feb 72
GRANT	OEG-7-71-0015(509)
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; *Counselors; Educational Counseling; *Educational Guidance; *Faculty Advisors; *Higher Education; Student Opinion

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain and compare perceptions of students relative to their academic advisement experiences with professional counselors and faculty advisors. A questionnaire was mailed to 225 present or past students of 3 community colleges in the states of Kansas, Missouri and Arkansas. Each student in the sample had experienced academic advisement from both a counselor and an academic advisor. Of the sample, 146 students responded by returning the completed questionnaire. In addition to the survey, a personal interview was conducted with 10 eligible students to provide validation for the questionnaire and supplementary information. The study revealed that counselors are significantly more concerned about students, more accepting of students, more genuine with students, more approachable to students, and more effective in meeting the advisement needs of students, than are faculty advisors. Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that colleges utilize more trained counselors in their advisement programs. It is also recommended that colleges make greater efforts to provide adequate advisement for the beginning student. (Author/HS)

ED 065088

BR 1-G-038
VCERD
HE

Final Report

Project No. 1–G–038

Grant No. OEG–7–71–0015 (509)

Joe B. Shelton

Johnson County Community Junior College

57th and Merriam Drive

Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66203

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY ACADEMIC ADVISING AND ACADEMIC ADVISING BY PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS

February 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE 003 249

Final Report

Project No. 1–G–038
Grant No. OEG–7–71–0015 (509)

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY ACADEMIC ADVISING AND ACADEMIC ADVISING BY PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS

Joe B. Shelton

Johnson County Community Junior College
57th and Merriam Drive
Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66203

February 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health. Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY ACADEMIC ADVISING AND ACADEMIC ADVISING BY PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS

AN ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain and compare perceptions of students relative to their academic advisement experiences with professional counselors and faculty advisors. A questionnaire was mailed to 225 present or past students of three Community Colleges in the states of Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas. Each student in the invited sample had experienced academic advisement from both a counselor and an academic advisor. Of the invited sample, 146 students responded by returning the completed questionnaire. In addition to the survey, a personal interview was conducted with 10 eligible students to provide validation for the questionnaire and supplementary information. The analysis consisted of computing a *t-Test for Dependent Samples* and computing mean scores by categories of age, sex, and grade-point average. This study revealed that counselors are significantly more concerned about students, more accepting of students, more genuine with students, more approachable to students, and more effective in meeting the advisement needs of students, than are faculty advisors. Based on the results of this study it is recommended that colleges utilize more trained counselors in their advisement programs. It is also recommended that colleges make greater efforts to provide adequate advisement for the younger, beginning student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	2
The Problem	2
The Purpose of the Study	3
Need for the Study	3
THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT	5
Limitations of the Study	5
Assumptions	5
Hypotheses	6
Definition of Terms	7
CHAPTER II	
A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
CHAPTER III	
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	16
Description of the Population	16
Description of the Sample	16
Construction of the Survey Instrument	16
Collection of the Data	18
Questionnaires	18
Interviews	18
Preparation of the Data	19
Statistical Treatment	19

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 21

Students' Perceptions of Concern 22

Students' Perceptions of Acceptance 25

Students' Perceptions of Genuineness 28

Students' Perceptions of Knowledge 31

Students' Perceptions of Approachability 34

Students' Perceptions of General Effectiveness 37

Students' Composite Perceptions 40

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF THE PERSONAL INTERVIEWS 43

Summary of Interviews 48

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 49

Summary 49

Findings and Conclusions 50

Recommendations 52

BIBLIOGRAPHY 53

APPENDICES 57

Appendix A – The Data-Gathering Instrument 58

Appendix B – Cover Letter 63

Appendix C – Follow-Up Letter 65

Appendix D – Coding Format for Data Cards 67

Appendix E – Interview Questions 70

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONCERN OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	23
2.	MEAN SCORES FOR CONCERN BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	24
3.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ACCEPTANCE OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	26
4.	MEAN SCORES FOR ACCEPTANCE BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	27
5.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENUINENESS OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	29
6.	MEAN SCORES FOR GENUINENESS BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	30
7.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGE OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	32
8.	MEAN SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	33
9.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF APPROACHABILITY OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	35
10.	MEAN SCORES FOR APPROACHABILITY BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	36
11.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	38
12.	MEAN SCORES FOR GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	39
13.	COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS FOR COMPOSITE OF ALL VARIABLES FOR COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS	41
14.	MEAN SCORES FOR COMPOSITE RATING BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The student entering college generally has many needs and decisions with which he is confronted. He is looking toward a vocation which requires the choosing of a curriculum with all its required, suggested, and related courses. He is considering job entry-level requirements and graduation requirements. He is concerned about the budgeting of time and money. He is more aware of the need for sound study habits and certainly in our complex society no student has immunity from personal problems. Where does this frustrated student get the assistance he so desperately needs?

The easy and traditional way for colleges to attempt to meet the students' needs is through faculty academic advisement programs. This method has many pros and cons, many instances of success and failure. However, as student needs become more complex, this method is being questioned and challenged.

A newer but more costly approach to meeting the needs of students is to eliminate formal faculty advisement and to extend the services of the professional counseling staff to include academic advisement. To implement this approach, the ratio of counselors to students must be sufficiently high so that the counselor's time is not fully taken up with academic problems. Obviously, adequate time should remain for other counseling services.

In the above paragraphs the background and setting have been described for the problem facing the researcher. Like other institutions throughout the nation, Johnson County Community College is vitally concerned about meeting the needs of its students. Not only is it concerned, but it is committed to the provision of adequate, total guidance services.

As plans were made for the college's first year of operation (1969-70), it was decided that the needs of the students could best be met by employing professional counselors to provide academic advisement, in addition to their other counseling duties. This decision was based in part on the fact that the teaching faculty was somewhat overloaded and that the enrollment for the first semester was relatively small (1380). Four professional counselors were employed to provide services for 1380 students.

In planning for the second year of operation, the same approach was used. For an enrollment of just over 2200 students, the counseling center was expanded to include seven professionals. A staff of this size was found to be quite functional, and apparently adequate services were provided.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Problem

The problem being considered in this study is accentuated by Johnson County Community College enrollment projections for the next few years. The projected enrollment for the fifth year of operation is in excess of 5000 students. This poses some very critical questions relative to the continued use of counselors to provide academic advisement. If the college continues with the present counselor-student ratio of approximately 1:300, by the fifth year the counseling staff would need to include at least seventeen professionals. Can the college justify this large counseling staff with its built-in facility and administrative problems? Should the faculty advisement method now be initiated, with the counseling staff leveling off at seven or eight professionals whose duties would include all counseling services except academic advisement? Do students perceive the assistance in academic planning that is provided by professional counselors to be significantly superior to assistance provided by faculty advisors? If counselors are significantly more effective in academic advisement than faculty advisors, then the college can justify the continuance of the present plan of advisement no matter what size staff is required. If counselors are not more effective than faculty advisors, the college should initiate plans to involve the faculty in student advisement.

Information relative to the effectiveness of both faculty advisors and counselors is very inconclusive. Yet, Johnson County Community College needs some current, relevant information to assist in the decisions at hand.

The Purpose of The Study

The purpose of this study is to add current information to the limited body of available information relative to the effectiveness of the traditional faculty academic advisement method as it compares with the newer method of using professional counselors to provide academic advisement.

Therefore, this study will attempt to answer the following specific questions:

1. Is there a difference between students' perception of Concern for them as a student and a person as exhibited by the faculty advisor and the professional counselor?
2. Is there a difference between students' perception of Acceptance of them as a student and a person as exhibited by the faculty advisor and the professional counselor?
3. Is there a difference between students' perception of Genuineness as exhibited by the faculty advisor and the professional counselor?
4. Is there a difference between students' perception of Knowledge, relative to vocational and academic questions as exhibited by the faculty advisor and the professional counselor?
5. Is there a difference between students' perception of Approachability as exhibited by the faculty advisor and the professional counselor?
6. Is there a difference between students' perception of the General Effectiveness of the faculty advisor and the professional counselor?

Need For The Study

As has been stated earlier, the easy way, and the traditional way, for colleges to assist the new student in his time of dilemma is to provide him with a college catalog and

assign him to a faculty advisor. When one considers the problems facing college students, this answer seems somewhat inadequate.

Never have college students faced decisions regarding so many careers, occupations, curricula, courses and graduation requirements. Each possibility contains the elements of frustration. Many of these elements are so common that they are overlooked by the colleges. In a study conducted by Myers, 300 freshmen were asked to list problems in an order of seriousness. It was found that

> More than 50 percent listed the following: (1) inability to study effectively, (2) fear of examinations, (3) lack of preparation for academic life, (4) inability to state own ideas, (5) inability to use textbooks effectively out of class, (6) inability to take notes, (7) inability to say anything in class about the work, (8) confusion at registration, and (9) lack of personal contact with teachers.[1]

Where are students getting assistance for these very real problems?

Most college catalogs offer little aid for the student. Course offerings have grown from a two to three page listing to several hundred separate courses from which to build a program. Occupations are becoming obsolete at a rapid rate and new occupations are being created at an equally rapid rate. Who can best help the student as he faces all these complex problems?

It is argued that faculty advisors should do the academic advising since they should know their field thoroughly. It is felt by many that the teacher by nature is an advisor. However, in a study of the state of academic advisement by Robertson in 1958, he described faculty advisement as a

> Semi-annual herding of hundreds of drafted faculty into an armory or gymnasium to plan programs and to approve election cards for students they do not know and for whom they have no continuing responsibility.[2]

This would certainly tend to disqualify faculty advising, as it presently exists, as the answer to the problems of students.

---

[1]Kent E. Myers. "College Freshman: A Faculty Responsibility," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 1964, 12:10.

[2]J. R. Robertson. "Academic Advising in College and Universities – Its Present State and Present Problems," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1958, 52:228-229.

It is felt that counselors are people oriented, not subject matter oriented. They are trained and hired to work with students. However, studies such as the three-year follow-up conducted by Burck, indicate that counseling does not result in significant influence on such factors as academic performance, retention, and even the appropriateness of vocational choices.

Can faculty advisors offer the assistance the student so desperately needs? Do counselors provide better assistance to students than do faculty advisors? Are either of these methods of providing academic assistance effective? These and other questions need to be answered more conclusively, not only for Johnson County Community College, but for all colleges. This study attempts to help answer these questions.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways:

1. The population in the study is limited to present students at Johnson County Community College, Longview Community College, Westark Community College, and to past students at these colleges who have transferred to adjacent colleges.

2. It is limited to variations in interpretation of the survey instrument by the respondents.

3. It is limited in that the variables selected for use in this study are not the only variables involved in definition of effective academic advisement.

Assumptions

It is assumed that students' perception is a valid measure of the effectiveness of academic advisement.

It is assumed that the survey instrument used in this study is a valid and reliable measure of student perceptions of their experiences with academic advisement. This instrument is discussed in Chapter III.

Basic Premise

> **For any advisor - advisee relationship to be successful and effective, the conditions of concern, acceptance, genuineness, knowledge, and approachability must be present, regardless of whether the advisor is of the teaching faculty or is a professional counselor.**

Hypotheses

As is pointed out in the review of related literature, the evidence relative to the effectiveness of either the faculty advisor or the counselor is rather sketchy and inconclusive. Logically, however, one could assume that the counselor whose primary and many times sole responsibility is to assist students in their needs, should be more effective in academic advisement than the faculty advisor. This assumption tends to be verified by the increasing number of colleges and universities that are changing from systems of faculty advisement to systems utilizing counselors. Within this theoretical framework the following hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. Students will perceive that counselors exhibit a greater degree of concern for them than do faculty advisors.

2. Students will perceive that counselors exhibit a greater degree of acceptance of them than do faculty advisors.

3. Students will perceive that counselors are more genuine in their responses than are faculty advisors.

4. Students will perceive that counselors are more knowledgeable about vocational and academic matters than are faculty advisors.

5. Students will perceive that counselors are more approachable than are faculty advisors.

6. Students will perceive that counselors provide them with a greater amount of assistance than do faculty advisors.

Definition of Terms

1. Faculty Advisor - A member of the teaching faculty who, in addition to his classroom duties, is assigned the responsibility of serving as academic advisor to a defined number of students.

2. Professional Counselor (or Counselor) - A non-teaching faculty member who has special training in the area of counseling and whose primary responsibility is to assist students in their various needs.

3. Concern - A quality possessed by an advisor or counselor which is characterized by a marked interest in and regard for the advisee and his problems and questions.

4. Acceptance - The uncensuring attitude of the advisor or counselor toward the advisee, implying understanding of the advisee's feelings and behavior and recognition of his worth as an individual.

5. Genuineness - The quality or state of being sincere and honest as opposed to being fake or counterfeit; the expression of what is actually felt or experienced.

6. Knowledge - The state of being well-informed about current academic and vocational information which is relative to the questions, concerns and needs of students.

7. Approachability - A quality or state of being easy to meet, easy to single out and converse with.

8. General Effectiveness - A quality of the advisor or counselor of being influencial or helpful to the student in his decision-making processes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An extensive review of related literature was made covering a period of about twenty years. No studies were found that directly compared faculty advising with advisement by counselors; however, several studies were found that are related to this study. Some of the more pertinent ones are included in this review.

Without question, the faculty dominates the academic advising programs at almost all colleges and universities. However, in recent years the effectiveness of this system has been questioned.

In 1958 J. R. Robertson attempted to study the state and problems of academic advisement in colleges and universities. His study was jointly financed by the University of Michigan and the Carnegie Corporation. He visited twenty institutions with the purpose in mind to answer seven basic questions about the actual state of advisement systems. In answering these questions, he arrived at some other questions even more basic than the original seven. These questions included: (1) Should there be an organized academic advising program? (2) What are the aims of a college advisement program? (3) Who should be an academic advisor? (4) What role do professional counselors have in the academic advising program?

A number of authors have attempted to answer some of these questions. Melvene Hardee, quoting President Pusey of Harvard and W. B. Perry, stated that:

> The advising function appears to be quite in harmony with the teacher's task of placing the subject to be learned in front of the learner . . . wakening the restless drive for answers and insights and enlarging the personal life and giving it meaning.[1]

However, in the same article Dr. Hardee outlined some sterotypes of faculty advisors. She mentioned such names as: the "Automat," the "Thousand-Mile Check-Up,"

---

[1]Melvene D. Hardee. "Faculty Advising in Contemporary Higher Education," *Educational Record*, 1961, 42:112-113.

the "Patch after Crash," and the "Mother Hen." It could be interpreted that although Dr. Hardee felt that faculty advisement as a system is sound, that it is also ineffective in its present state.

In a study conducted by Donk and Oetting at Colorado State University in 1968, they found that only twenty-five percent of the 366 faculty members responding to an advising questionnaire felt that the faculty advisement system was effective. An interesting aspect of their results was that although twenty-five percent felt the system was effective, eighty-three percent viewed their own advising as adequate. Their study also showed that:

> Students did not go to their advisors because they did not feel they knew him well, their advisor was not interested in them, or was too busy to talk.[1]

The results of their study also indicated that there is less need for a formal system of advising for upperclassmen than for freshman and sophomore students.

Faculty advisors argue that they do not have enough time to adequately advise students. Jack Rossman designed a study to determine if the provisions of released time for faculty members to do academic advising would improve the quality of the advising. For two years six faculty members at Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota were given released time and an advisee load of twenty students. A control group consisted of the remaining freshmen students assigned in the usual way to advisors. Results indicated that the experimental group were more satisfied with their advisors due to increased contact, but:

> There were no significant differences between the two groups in (1) rate of retention, (2) grade point average, (3) level of aspiration, (4) satisfaction with college, and (5) perception of the campus.[2]

In answering the question "Who should be an academic advisor?" Judith Kranes in her article in the *Journal of Educational Sociology* in 1960 stated that:

> Probably the best university advisor is the teacher, who along

---

[1]Leonard J. Donk and Eugene R. Oetting. "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 1968, 9:402.

[2]Jack E. Rossman. "Released Time for Faculty Advising: The Impact Upon Freshman," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1967, 47:362-363.

> with his wisdom and empathy, can depend upon an easy kind of nature, and his acceptance of others.[1]

In a recent article by Twyman Jones in the *Junior College Journal*, he tended to agree with Kranes, Hardee and others, that teaching faculty members should handle the academic advising of students. However, he indicated that present faculty advisement systems are performing inadequately. This is inferred by his statement that:

> There is a general consensus that as a total group, members of the teaching faculty perform miserably when attempting to advise students relative to course selection, proper sequencing of courses, graduation requirements, etc.[2]

He suggested that the inadequacies of faculty advising systems are probably due to problems ranging from a lack of in-service training programs to disinterest on the part of some advisors in the tasks to be performed.

Another study which tends to point out the inadequacies of faculty advisement was one conducted by Jamrich.[3]He studied the approaches to faculty advising among liberal arts colleges. The results of his study indicated that only one-third of the institutions completing the questionnaire described their faculty advisement programs as successful.

In an attempt to shed new light on the question of the effectiveness of faculty advising; Josiah S. Dilley performed a series of studies at the University of Wisconsin. He attempted to determine staff availability to students and then attempted to determine whether or not students go to available advisors. He concluded that faculty members are apt to be inaccessible when students try to contact them in their offices. In his study only fifty percent were accessible. He also concluded that students do not really desire to see their advisor. Fifty percent of a freshman class indicated that they had never tried to contact a faculty member outside of class. Only fourteen and eleven percent respectively of an undergraduate sample said they often go to faculty advisors and professors for help.

---

[1]J. E. Kranes. "University Teacher-Advisement of the Young Undergraduate," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 1960, 33:338.

[2]Twyman Jones. "The Counselor and His Role," *Junior College Journal*, 1970, 40:12.

[3]J. Jamrich. "Organizational Practices in Student Faculty Counseling Programs in Small Colleges," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 1955, 41:36-40.

He suggested that the noncommunication that exists between student and faculty is caused by both of these factors: faculty inaccessibility and lack of desire on the part of the student.

A more basic and significant conclusion of Dilley's studies was the fact that:

> At the present time, little evidence can be found to support the belief that out-of-class student-faculty contacts are of value.[1]

He further concluded that if faculty advisement is of no value, then we should stop talking about it in a negative way and proceed to more important matters since such negative talk gives students a good rationalization for their non-successes and constricts other faculty-student relations.

After reading about all the problems of using faculty as academic advisor, one might jump to the conclusion that the use of counselors as academic advisors would provide effective advisement for students. This would be an easy conclusion to draw since theoretically counselors are people oriented as opposed to subject matter oriented. Also, they have no vested interest except the mental health and academic progress of the student. They are hired for one purpose and that is to devote their entire effort to counseling. It is easy to say that counselors should be more effective with students than faculty advisors. But are they? The evidence is somewhat inconclusive.

In a study conducted by Koile and Bird in 1956, it was determined that students preferred counselors over faculty advisors as sources of assistance for their problems. They found that:

> For approximately fifty-eight percent of their problems, freshmen chose the counselor most frequently as a source of assistance. The advisor was ranked next.[2]

This study would indicate that the system of using counselors as advisors is superior to the system of using faculty advisors.

Other research evidence attesting to the effectiveness of counselors is very limited.

---

[1]Josiah S. Dilley, "Student-Faculty Noncommunication," *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1967, 8:285.

[2]Earl A. Koile and Dorothy Bird. "Preferences for Counselor Help on Freshman Problems," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1956, 3:105.

Jones, in his 1970 article, mentioned that we make the assumption that counselors do a better job of providing accurate information to students than do faculty advisors. He stated that:

> Since there is a paucity of data in this area, this assumption is almost exclusively based on empirical observation.[1]

He further stated that:

> There is a critical need for some hard-nosed research aimed at answering the question of what academic advisement method enables students to receive the best possible information on which they can base decisions concerning course selection.[2]

In a three-year follow-up study conducted by Harman Burck,[3] he found that counselors are able to accelerate the change from inappropriate to more appropriate aspirations but these changes in appropriateness are not reflected by changes in academic performance. His study also indicated that counselors had no influence on college retention.

In her book *The Work of The Counselor.* Leona Tyler, after studying the effects of counseling in academic settings, tentatively concluded that:

> The value of counseling in improvement of achievement is not very great.[4]

Elliott, Lindsay and Shookley designed a study to compare the differences in first-term grade point average of three groups of students: counseled prior to registration, students counseled after registration, and students who received no counseling.[5] They found that differences between the means for those counseled and those not counseled was approximately .17 of a letter grade. This was not a significant difference; however, the authors felt that a trend did exist which differentiated between students counseled and those not counseled. A very interesting fact was found in the study of two-year

---

[1]Twyman Jones. "The Counselor and His Role," *Junior College Journal,* 1970, 40:12.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]Harman D. Burck. "Counseling College Freshmen: A Three Year Follow-Up," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 1969, 10:21-25.

[4]Leona E. Tyler. *The Work of The Counselor,* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, p.285.

[5]Earl S. Elliott, Carl A. Lindsay, and Vernon L. Shockley. "Counseling Status and Academic Achievement of College Freshment", *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1968, 47:364-368.

colleges. Students who were not counseled at all were more successful than students who were counseled during the fall. This would suggest that registration counseling should be pre-registration counseling in order to provide any influences on students.

After reviewing these last few studies it would appear that counselors have not proven themselves to be effective in the assistance of students with academic problems. Neither method of advisement is proven to be significantly superior over the other.

There is a great amount of disagreement among researchers relative to evaluation of counselor or advisor effectiveness. In most of the studies cited above such things as grade point average, retention, level or aspiration, etc. were used. Perhaps it would be useful to examine the significance and usefulness of the criterion, client satisfaction, as a measure of effectiveness.

A few authors, including C. H. Patterson,[1] tended to disqualify the feelings of the student as having validity in counselor and advisor evaluation. Disagreeing with Patterson and others are Goodstein and Grigg who indicated that the importance of client satisfaction as a criterion is obvious. They suggested that the understanding and direct handling of the student's expectations are in essence meeting the student's needs.

In an earlier article by these two authors, they referred to clients or students as independent observers who should be capable of rating some of the aspects of the counselor or advisors performance. They stated that:

> What exists here is a pool or independent observers of fairly well-delineated job performance, namely a counselor as he goes about his assignment of entering into rapport with others.[2]

They further defined this performance as:

> Responding to these clients and their problems according to his

[1] C. H. Patterson. "Client Expectations and Social Conditioning," *Personnel Journal*, 1958, 37:136-138.

[2] Austin E. Grigg and Leonard D. Goodstein. "The Use of Clients as Judges of the Counselors Performance," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1957, 4:31.

> own style of performing and according to his own particular theoretical beliefs, dogma, and training.[1]

Other writers, including Mowrer, Talland and Clark, and Forgy and Black, have attested to the validity of using the client as a method of obtaining an evaluation of the counseling session.

It would have to be concluded from the research and writings cited in this review that the evidence that now exists relative to the effectiveness of counselors and advisors is inconclusive. It can be further concluded that the possibility of using the students as an evaluator of the effectiveness of the counselor and advisor has validity.

---

[1]Austin E. Grigg and Leonard D. Goodstein, "The Use of Clients as Judges of the Counselors Performance," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1957, 4:31.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter explains the procedures used in designing this study. Methods used to collect, prepare, and treat the data are described in some detail.

Description of the Population

The population for this study consisted of students at three Community Colleges, who could be identified as having experienced one semester or more of academic advisement from both a faculty advisor and a counselor. The colleges selected, in addition to Johnson County Community College, were Longview Community College, Lee's Summit, Missouri, and Westark Community College, Fort Smith, Arkansas. The selection of these two colleges was based on their similarity in size, type of student served, and philosophy, to Johnson County Community College. The population also included some past students of these three colleges who have recently transferred to four-year institutions.

Approximately 700 students from the three colleges were identified as being eligible for this study. This identification was made by using permanent record folders and advisory assignment records.

Description of the Sample

The sample in this study included 225 students randomly drawn from the roster of students identified as being eligible for the study. Selection procedures were continued until the sample included 75 present or past students from each of the three colleges.

Construction of the Survey Instrument

The researcher used as the basis for construction of the survey instrument the

"Counseling Evaluation Inventory" developed by Linden, Stone, and Shertzer at Purdue University. An evaluation of the CEI by Haase and Miller has demonstrated significant test-retest stability and discriminative and/or congruent validity. From the twenty-one items included in the CEI a total of five items were selected to be included in this survey instrument. This selection was based on their appropriateness for both the counselor and the faculty advisor.

The questionnaire itself is not similar to the CEI. It consists of a total of twelve items with each variable being measured by two separate items. A general effectiveness variable was added to the original five variables and it too is measured by two items. It is felt that this instrument will provide stable and accurate information about the students' perceptions of their experiences with counselors and faculty advisors. This assumption is based on the close relationship of the variables to the items on the CEI. To provide further information about the questionnaire, copies were submitted to a number of college counselors and faculty advisors who were asked to judge the instrument as to its appropriateness for the study. The questionnaire was administered to 30 students on a trial basis to help identify items that needed clarification.

The five variables measured by the questionnaire are as follows: (1) Concern, (2) Acceptance, (3) Genuineness, (4) Knowledge, and (5) Approachability. The variable of General Effectiveness was added to the original five to get an overall opinion. Certainly there are additional important variables, however it is felt that the variables or factors included in this study should be present in every successful academic advisor-student relationship regardless of whether the advisor is of the teaching faculty or is a professional counselor.

At the beginning of the questionnaire three additional areas of information were requested. Each person was asked his age, sex, and approximate grade-point average. This information was requested to provide a clear picture of the make-up of the sample and to see if perceptions of students from the various catagories are different. A sample of the survey instrument is found in appendix A.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were mailed to home addresses of the students included in the study beginning the first of May. In addition to the questionnaire, the mailing included a letter of introduction, a page of instructions for the questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

A follow-up letter was mailed approximately one month after the original mailing. It included another copy of the questionnaire, the instruction sheet and self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Samples of the items included in the mailings are included in the appendix.

Interviews

Interviews were used in this study to validate and supplement information obtained from the completed questionnaires.[1] The interviews were designed to provide information in two specific areas:

1. Can students actually distinguish between experiences with faculty advisors and experiences with counselors?

2. Do responses to the questionnaire differ to any degree from responses made in the personal interviews?

Ten students, all from Johnson County Community College, were interviewed, utilizing approximately fifteen minutes in each session. The selection of the students to be interviewed was based primarily on their having had advisement from both advisors and counselors and their availability for the interview. A male-female ratio of 4:6 was

[1]David J. Fox. *The Research Process in Education*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969, p. 543.

arbitrarily selected to correspond with the ratio of the original sample. None of the students interviewed were part of the sample receiving questionnaires.

The results of these interviews are discussed in narrative form in Chapter V.

PREPARATION OF THE DATA

The data processing facilities at Johnson County Community College were used for card punching, sorting and verifying. The actual ratings by the students were transferred from the returned questionnaire to the IBM cards. Each card contains the complete ratings by a student of their experiences with both advisor and counselor, as well as information relative to the respondents age, sex, and grade-point average.

An explanation of the coding system for the IBM cards is found in appendix D.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

The IBM 360 computer located on the University of Arkansas campus was used to analyze the data. A dependent *t*-test utilizing the formula presented by Ferguson,[1] $t = \frac{\Sigma D}{\sqrt{[N\Sigma D^2 - (\Sigma D)^2]/(N-1)}}$ was used to determine the significance of the difference between the means of the student's perceptions of their experiences with advisors and counselors. This test is appropriate since the data to be treated was derived from paired observations.

The .05 level of significance was arbitrarily chosen as the level of acceptance or rejection of hypotheses. The use of the .05 level of significance means that if a significant difference is found, there is a 95% likelihood that this difference is due to something other than chance.

In addition to the *t*-test cited above, mean scores were computed and analyzed to

[1]George A. Ferguson. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education,* New York: McGraw Hill, Inc. 1969.

determine if there are differences in the six variables for advisors and counselors, as perceived by students, that are associated with (1) age of the student, (2) sex of the student, and (3) grade-point average of the student.

A presentation and analysis of the data are found in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The main purpose of this chapter is to present and to analyze the data collected during the investigation to determine if significant differences exist between students' perceptions of their academic advisement experiences with counselors and their experiences with faculty advisors. The data were collected, analyzed, and tabulated and are presented in this chapter to accept or reject the six hypotheses which were derived for study. The following hypotheses were stated in Chapter I:

1. Students will perceive that counselors exhibit a greater degree of concern for them than do faculty advisors.

2. Students will perceive that counselors exhibit a greater degree of acceptance of them than do faculty advisors.

3. Students will perceive that counselors are more genuine in their responses than are faculty advisors.

4. Students will perceive that counselors are more knowledgeable about vocational and academic matters than are faculty advisors.

5. Students will perceive that counselors are more approachable than are faculty advisors.

6. Students will perceive that counselors provide them with a greater amount of assistance than do faculty advisors.

Another purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data collected during the investigation to determine if there are differences in the six variables for counselors and advisors, as perceived by students, that are associated with (1) age of the student, (2)

sex of the student, and (3) grade-point average of the student. Mean scores for each variable by the various classifications of students are presented in tabular form and are discussed.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONCERN AS EXHIBITED BY THE COUNSELOR AND FACULTY ADVISOR

Comparisons were made between the students' responses relative to concern by the counselor and by the advisor. Mean scores, difference scores, and the significance of difference were obtained utilizing the *t-Test for Dependent Samples* as described in Chapter III. This comparison is presented in Table 1.

An examination of the mean scores in Table 1 reveal a mean score of 7.21 for counselors and a mean score of 6.53 for faculty advisors with a difference score of 0.67. The computed *t*-value for this set of scores was determined to be 3.8242. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance was computed at 0.0002. This greatly exceeds the .05 level of significance arbitrarily selected for this study.

These data support the acceptance of hypothesis one, that students in this study perceive that counselors exhibit a greater degree of concern for them in their problems than do faculty advisors.

In consideration of the perceptions of students as they might be associated with age, sex, and grade-point average, it is noted from Table 2 that older students do not feel that counselors and advisors are as concerned about them as do younger students. The composite mean score for 18-19 year old students was computed at 7.50 as compared with 6.57 for those students 22 years and older. It should be noted that there is very little or no difference in the way male and female students perceive concern of counselors and advisors. Table 2 further indicates that average students tend to perceive the greater amount of concern by counselors and advisors. Students with low grade-point averages tend to feel that counselors and advisors are less concerned about them than do better students.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF CONCERN OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	7.21	6.53
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	1.83	1.83
DIFFERENCE SCORE	0.67	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	2.12	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	3.8242	
PROBABILITY	0.0002	

TABLE 2

MEAN SCORES FOR CONCERN BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	8.14	6.86
20–21 yrs	64	7.36	6.75
22 & over	68	6.87	6.26
	SEX		
MALE	67	7.19	6.54
FEMALE	79	7.22	6.53
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	7.04	6.35
2.7–3.4	46	6.85	6.41
2.0–2.6	71	7.55	6.69
1.9 & under	6	6.50	6.33

This table provides descriptive data only. Tests of significance are found in Table 14.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ACCEPTANCE AS EXHIBITED BY COUNSELORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS

Table 3 presents a comparison of students' responses relative to the acceptance displayed by counselors and advisors. It is revealed that the mean score for counselors is 6.73 as compared with 6.38 for advisors, with a difference score of 0.35. The *t*-test produced a *t*-value for this set of data of 2.6101. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance was computed at 0.0100.

These test statistics indicate that there is a significant difference between students' perceptions of acceptance as exhibited by counselors and advisors and this difference is in favor of the counselors. This information supports the acceptance of hypothesis two as stated.

In consideration of the students' ratings by age, it is noted in Table 4 that the younger students tend to feel more accepted by counselors and advisors than do older students. Female students tend to perceive a greater acceptance from counselors than do male students, while male students rated advisors higher on acceptance than did female students. Students with high grade-point averages (3.5 and above) and average grade-point averages (2.0-2.6) tend to feel the greatest acceptance by counselors and advisors. The students with low grade-point averages (1.9 and under) tend to perceive a smaller degree of acceptance than do better students.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF
ACCEPTANCE OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	6.73	6.38
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	1.60	1.59
DIFFERENCE SCORE	0.35	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	1.62	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	2.6101	
PROBABILITY	0.0100	

TABLE 4

MEAN SCORES FOR ACCEPTANCE BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	7.71	6.64
20–21 yrs	64	6.88	6.48
22 & over	68	6.38	6.22
	SEX		
MALE	67	6.55	6.43
FEMALE	79	6.87	6.33
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	6.65	6.65
2.7–3.4	46	6.85	6.09
2.0–2.6	71	6.69	6.51
1.9 & under	6	6.50	6.00

This table provides descriptive data only. Tests of significance are found in Table 14.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENUINENESS AS EXHIBITED BY COUNSELORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS

In Table 5 a presentation is made of a comparison of students' responses relative to the genuineness of advisors and counselors. The table reveals a mean score of 7.30 for counselors and a mean score of 6.81 for advisors. The difference score is 0.49. The computed *t*-value for this set of scores is 2.7033. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance was computed at 0.0077.

The test statistics from this table indicate that there is a significant difference between students' perceptions of the genuineness of counselors and advisors, and this difference is in favor of the counselors. This information supports the acceptance of hypothesis three.

The statistics in Table 6 indicate that the younger students (18-19) perceive a greater degree of genuineness on the part of counselors and advisors than do the older students. Although the difference is not great, male students feel that both counselors and advisors are more genuine in their relations with them than do female students. Calculations produced a mean composite score for male students of 7.17 and a mean score for the female students of 6.96. In looking at scores in relation to grade-point averages, it is noted that average students (2.0-2.6) tend to perceive counselors and advisors as being more genuine than do other GPA levels. As in all the previously reported variables, the students with grade-point averages of 1.9 and under perceive less genuineness by counselors and advisors than the more superior students.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF
GENUINENESS OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	7.30	6.81
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	1.89	2.06
DIFFERENCE SCORE	0.35	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	2.20	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	2.7033	
PROBABILITY	0.0077	

TABLE 6

MEAN SCORES FOR GENUINENESS
BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	7.93	7.43
20–21 yrs	64	7.30	6.98
22 & over	68	7.18	6.51
	SEX		
MALE	67	7.37	6.97
FEMALE	79	7.24	6.67
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	7.30	6.91
2.7–3.4	46	7.11	6.72
2.0–2.6	71	7.48	6.92
1.9 & under	6	6.67	6.83

This table provides descriptive data only. Tests of significance are found in Table 14.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGE OF COUNSELORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS

Table 7 presents a comparison of students' perceptions of knowledge exhibited by counselors and advisors relative to academic and vocational matters. The computed mean score for counselors is 7.20 as compared with the advisor's mean score of 7.01. The difference score is 0.18 with a computed *t*-value of 1.1059. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance is recorded as 0.2706.

It is noted that the students perceived counselors as being more knowledgeable than advisors; however, the difference is not statistically significant since the level of significance did not reach the .05 level. The test statistics relative to knowledge supports the rejection of hypothesis four.

In considering age of students and their perceptions of the knowledge of counselors and advisors, the information from Table 8 indicates that the younger students (18-19 yrs) tend to provide higher ratings. Male and female perceptions of the knowledge of counselors and advisors tend to be very similar. Highest ratings of counselors were provided by students with a grade-point average of 3.5 and over, while the average student (2.0-2.6) provided the highest rating for the advisors. The students with grade-point averages of 1.9 and under provided the lowest ratings for this variable.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF KNOWLEDGE OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	7.20	7.01
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	1.70	1.63
DIFFERENCE SCORE	0.18	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	2.02	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	1.1059	
PROBABILITY	0.2706	

TABLE 8

MEAN SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	7.79	7.09
20–21 yrs	64	7.22	7.25
22 & over	68	7.06	6.78
	SEX		
MALE	67	7.06	7.12
FEMALE	79	7.32	6.92
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	7.57	6.87
2.7–3.4	46	7.04	7.00
2.0–2.6	71	7.25	7.10
1.9 & under	6	6.33	6.67

This table provides descriptive data only. Tests of significance are found in Table 14.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF APPROACHABILITY OF COUNSELORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS

In Table 9 a presentation is made of a comparison of students' responses to the questions relative to how approachable they perceive counselors and advisors to be. It is noted from the table that the mean score for counselors is 6.96 and the mean score for advisors is 6.47. The difference score is 0.49 and is in favor of the counselors. The computed *t*-value for this set of scores is determined to be 2.5692. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance is computed at 0.0112 which exceeds the .05 level of significance selected for the study.

These test statistics supports the acceptance of hypothesis five, that students in the study perceive counselors to be more approachable than faculty advisors.

As for the previously discussed variables, younger students continue to provide higher ratings for counselors and advisors than do older students. In Table 10 it is reported that the 18-19 year old students had a composite mean score of 7.50 as compared with 6.68 for the 20-21 year old students and 6.59 for those students 22 years old and over. There is essentially no difference in the way male and female students rate the approachability of counselors and advisors with composite mean scores of 6.71 for males and 6.72 for females. The trend for students with high (3.5 and over) and average (2.0-2.6) grade-point averages to provide higher rating of counselors and advisors continues. These two groups perceive that counselors and advisors are considerably more approachable than do high average (2.7-3.4) and low average students. The students with low grade-point averages (1.9 and under) continue to provide low ratings. In the case of approachability for advisors, this group provided the lowest rating in the entire study (4.83).

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF
APPROACHABILITY OF COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	6.96	6.47
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	1.89	2.17
DIFFERENCE SCORE	0.49	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	2.29	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	2.5692	
PROBABILITY	0.0112	

TABLE 10

MEAN SCORES FOR APPROACHABILITY BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	8.21	6.79
20–21 yrs	64	6.84	6.52
22 & over	68	6.81	6.37
	SEX		
MALE	67	6.84	6.58
FEMALE	79	7.06	6.38
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	7.52	6.61
2.7–3.4	46	6.39	6.00
2.0–2.6	71	7.21	6.87
1.9 & under	6	6.17	4.83

This table provides descriptive data only. Tests of significance are found in Table 14.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSELORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS

Students were asked to respond to questions relative to the assistance received from counselors and advisors. Table 11 presents a comparison of these responses. Computation revealed a mean score for counselors of 6.95 and a mean score for advisors of 6.19. The difference score for the mean scores is 0.75 and is in favor of the counselor. The *t*-value computed for this set of scores is reported at 3.7227. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance is computed at 0.0003 which is highly significant since it greatly exceeds the .05 level of significance.

These test statistics indicate that there is a significant difference in students' perceptions of the effectiveness of counselors and advisors. This supports acceptance of hypothesis six, that counselors are perceived to be more effective than are advisors.

In consideration of age of students and perceptions of counselor and advisor effectiveness, it is noted from Table 12 that the younger students perceive counselors and advisors to be more effective than do older students. The ratings continue to become smaller as the age increases. The 18-19 year old group provided a mean score of 7.79 as compared with the older groups (22 years and over) mean score of 6.53. Male and female students tend to differ very little in their perceptions of the effectiveness of counselors and advisors. The composite mean score for males was 6.53 as compared to a mean score of 6.60 for females. Average students (2.0-2.6) presented the highest mean score for counselor and advisor effectiveness. Following closely were students with grade-point averages of 3.5 and over. Students with grade-point averages of 1.9 and under provided low ratings of effectiveness of both counselors and advisors.

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS OF
COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	6.95	6.19
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	1.94	1.93
DIFFERENCE SCORE	0.75	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	2.45	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	3.7227	
PROBABILITY	0.0003	

TABLE 12

MEAN SCORES FOR GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	7.79	7.00
20–21 yrs	64	7.20	6.33
22 & over	68	6.53	5.90
	SEX		
MALE	67	6.87	6.19
FEMALE	79	7.01	6.19
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	6.87	6.35
2.7–3.4	46	6.76	6.02
2.0–2.6	71	7.20	6.30
1.9 & under	6	5.67	5.67

This table provides descriptive data only. Tests of significance are found in Table 14.

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS FOR COMPOSITE OF ALL VARIABLES FOR COUNSELORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS

In addition to looking at the perceptions of students relative to the six variables included in this study, a comparison was made of perceptions of counselors and advisors on a composite of all six variables. Although these data are not used to accept or reject a hypothesis, it is the opinion of the writer that an overall analysis is meaningful. A presentation of this information is found in Table 13.

An examination of Table 13 reveals a composite mean score of 42.34 for counselors and a composite mean score of 39.40 for advisors. The difference score for these means is 2.94. Further analysis of these data provides a *t*-value of 3.4308. The probability of this difference value occurring by chance is computed at 0.0008 which is highly significant since it greatly exceeds the .05 level.

The test statistics from Table 13 indicate that, on a composite basis, students provide a higher rating for counselors than for advisors and the difference between these two ratings is highly significant.

An examination of Table 14 provides a comparison of composite mean scores by class of respondent. Since age is a class that has potential for administrative manipulation and since students provide higher ratings for counselors than for advisors; it was determined that a test of significance of difference between the means for counselors as provided by the three age levels was needed. Computations revealed that differences between the means for the 18-19 year old and the means of both the older groups are significant at the .05 level. Differences between the means of the two older groups are not significant at the .05 level. Ratings of male and female students differ very little. Average students provide the highest ratings of counselors and advisors, followed closely by students in the 3.5 and over category. Without exception, the low student (1.9 and under) provide the lowest ratings of both counselor and advisor.

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
FOR COMPOSITE OF ALL VARIABLES FOR
COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS

TERM	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
SAMPLE SIZE	146	146
MEAN SCORES	42.34	39.40
STANDARD DEVIATIONS	9.01	9.29
DIFFERENCE SCORE	2.94	
DIFFERENCE S. D.	10.35	
COMPUTED *t*-VALUE	3.4308	
PROBABILITY	0.0008	

TABLE 14

MEAN SCORES FOR COMPOSITE RATING BY CLASS OF RESPONDENTS

CLASS	NO. RESP.	COUNSELOR	ADVISOR
	AGE		
18–19 yrs	14	47.57	41.79
20–21 yrs	64	42.80	40.31
22 & over	68	40.82	38.04
	SEX		
MALE	67	41.88	39.84
FEMALE	79	42.72	39.03
	GRADE–POINT AVERAGE		
3.5 & over	23	42.96	39.74
2.7–3.4	46	41.00	38.24
2.0–2.6	71	43.38	40.38
1.9 & under	6	37.83	35.33

*Test of significance of difference, 18-19 yrs. and 20-21 yrs. *t*-value 1.91.

*Test of significance of difference, 18-19 yrs. and 22 and over. *t*-value 2.65.

Test of significance of difference, 20-21 yrs. and 22 and over. *t*-value 0.77.

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

CHAPTER V

INTERVIEWS

It was the opinion of the writer that there was a need for some type of information to supplement and validate the data obtained from the questionnaires. It was determined that structured personal interviews would provide this information. The interviews were structured to provide information in two areas:

1. Can students actually distinguish between experiences with faculty advisors and experiences with counselors?

2. Do responses to the questionnaire differ to any degree from responses made in the personal interview?

A further purpose of the interviews was the possibility that they might reveal some information totally unrelated to the questionnaire.

The writer conducted interviews with ten students. The length of the sessions varied but generally required about fifteen minutes. The first few minutes were used to explain the purpose of the interview and how the information was to be used. The remaining time was spent obtaining answers to the interview items.

The selection of the students was based primarily on (1) advisement experiences with both faculty advisor and counselor, (2) availability for the interview and (3) a male-female ratio similar to the ratio of the original sample. No effort was made to randomize the selection, nor was any effort made to omit or include certain qualified students. The final selection included four males and six females. None of the students interviewed were part of the sample receiving questionnaires.

Eight questions constituted the points of focus for the interviews. Each question and a discussion of the responses are listed below

1. Are students able to make distinctions between counselors and advisors?

All ten of the students interviewed understood that advisors were members of the teaching faculty and were assigned advisory responsibilities in addition to their teaching loads. They further indicated that counselors worked in advisement on a full-time basis. Eight of the students possessed knowledge of the difference between a counselor and an advisor as primarily being a full-time advisement role for the counselor as opposed to a part-time advisement role for the advisor. Five of the students, one male and four female, expressed an awareness of the counselors ability and availability to assist them in problems not directly related to advisement.

To summarize the students' comments, one could say that, in general, students do not fully understand the differences between the positions of faculty advisor and counselor but do make a rather clear distinction between the advisor and counselor in relation to their roles in the advisement procedures.

2. How do sessions with counselors and advisors compare in length and frequency?

The sessions with advisors were held just prior to registration or during registration. The students described these sessions as being very short, about ten minutes was the most frequently mentioned time. One student indicated that he met with his advisor for fifteen to twenty minutes while another student laughed when the interviewer asked about the length of the session and stated that his advisor just signed his program card and went on to the next student. Two of the students met with their advisors in a private office while eight of the students saw their advisor with other advisees in the immediate area. No contacts were made with the advisor other than at registration time.

The sessions with counselors were generally held some weeks prior to registration. The length of the sessions with the counselors varied from twenty minutes to one hour with the most frequently mentioned time being thirty to forty minutes. Four of the ten

students had scheduled an additional advisement session with their counselor. One student had gone to the counselors office but found his counselor busy and did not return.

3. How knowledgeable are advisors and counselors about academic and vocational matters?

The students' comments about the knowledge of advisors and counselors were very similar. With two exceptions, the students indicated that both their counselor and advisor had adequate knowledge to assist them in academic advisement. The two exceptions were indications by two students that their counselor was very knowledgeable about transfer requirements to four-year colleges.

The interview results tended to validate the data obtained from the questionnaires which indicated that differences in knowledge of counselors and advisors are not significant.

4. Are counselors and advisors interested in and concerned for the students?

The students' comments to this question are quite easily summarized. Two of the ten students indicated their advisor was very interested in and concerned for them. Two students indicated that some concern and interest was exhibited by their advisor while the remaining six students indicated that their advisor had little or no concern for them.

Five of the ten students indicated that their counselor had interest in and concern for them. Three students indicated that their counselor had some concern while the remaining two students did not feel that their counselor was concerned about them. One of the last two students commenting about his counselor said, "He was just doing a job."

5. Do counselors and advisors make the student feel free to schedule additional sessions or approach them for additional assistance?

In general the students did feel that they could go back to their counselor for additional help. Without exception, the students had been invited to come by the counselors office at any time.

Students did not feel the same way about their advisors. In general they did not feel free to go to their advisors for additional assistance, in fact, about half of the students did not realize that this would be an appropriate thing for them to do.

The frequency of sessions with advisors and counselors as discussed under question number two tend to validate the students' comments to this question.

6. Are advisors and counselors genuine in their efforts to assist the student?

7. Are advisors and counselors accepting of students in their indecisions, vacillations, and modern attitudes?

The writer has chosen to group these two questions due to the similarity of response by the students. The students tended to be somewhat guarded and non-committal in their comments to both of these questions. In general the students questioned the genuineness and acceptance of both the advisor and the counselor. The comments were somewhat more positive in favor of the counselors.

An exception to the guarded attitude was one male student who admitted his advisor was genuine. He said, "My advisor didn't like me, he didn't want to help me, so he was genuine."

8. Do advisors and counselors provide the assistance that is needed by the students?

The students' comments to this question were quite varied. While commenting about their advisor, about half the students indicated that they received considerable assistance

while the remaining five students said they received little assistance.

The students were more positive about the help provided by their counselors. Eight of the students indicated that their counselor had been very helpful to them, while two did not feel they had received much assistance. It was indicated that counselors were considerably more helpful than advisors in making plans to transfer to other colleges.

SUMMARY

Information obtained from the interviews would indicate that students do recall experiences with counselors and advisors vividly enough to make valid observations.

Comments made by the ten students would support the following statements:

1. Sessions with counselors are longer and more private than sessions with advisors.

2. Both advisors and counselors have adequate knowledge about academic advisement with counselors being somewhat more skilled in college transfer planning.

3. Counselors tend to be more interested in and concerned for the students than do academic advisors.

4. Counselors are more likely to have students approach them for additional advisement than are advisors.

5. In general, students tend to question the genuineness and acceptance of both counselor and advisor with somewhat more positive feeling toward the counselor.

6. In general, students indicate that counselors provide greater assistance to them than do advisors. This is particularly true in the case of college-transfer planning.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a brief summary of the procedures followed in conducting this investigation. A statement of the findings and conclusions are included along with recommendations for further research.

SUMMARY

This study was conducted for the purpose of obtaining and comparing the perceptions of college students concerning their academic advisement experiences with faculty advisors and professional counselors. An analysis of the differences of these perceptions was made to determine which of these methods of advisement is best meeting the needs and expectations of the students.

The participants in this study consisted of 156 present or past students of three Community Colleges located in the states of Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas. Each participant had experienced one semester or more of academic advisement with both faculty advisor and counselor.

A survey instrument was developed using as its basis the "Counseling Evaluation Inventory" developed by Linden, Stone, and Shertzer at Purdue University. The questionnaire purported to assess students' perceptions of their experiences with counselors and advisors relative to six variables: Concern, Knowledge, Approachability, Acceptance, Genuineness, and General Effectiveness. Following validation procedures, this questionnaire was mailed to 225 students randomly selected from a roster of eligible students. Completed questionnaires were received from 146 respondents which provided data for the statistical analysis.

Ratings from the returned questionnaires were transferred to IBM cards. The IBM 360 Computer at the University of Arkansas was used to analyze the data. A *t-Test for Dependent Samples* was utilized to determine the significance of the differences between the means of the students' perceptions of their experiences with advisors and counselors.

Personal interviews were conducted for the purpose of validating information obtained from the questionnaires and to provide supplemental data. Ten students were arbitrarily selected to participate in personal interviews. This selection was based on eligibility to participate in the study and availability for the interview. Interview results are reported in narrative form in Chapter V.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the data consisted of *t*-tests being applied to each of the six variables plus a seventh variable which is a composite of the first six. This analysis was made to determine the acceptance or rejection of the six previously stated hypothesis.

Mean scores were computed and analyzed to determine if there are differences in the above mentioned variables that are related to (1) age of the student, (2) sex of the student, and (3) grade-point average of the student.

Based on the statistical data from this study, the investigator reached the following conclusions concerning students' perceptions of faculty advisor and counselor traits:

1. Counselors exhibit a greater amount of concern for students and their problems than do faculty advisors. The *t*-value of 3.8242 for Concern was significant at the .0002 level.

2. Counselors are more accepting of students than are faculty advisors. The perceptions of students provided data for a *t*-value of 2.6101. This *t*-value is significant at the .0100 level.

3. Counselors are more genuine in their responses to and communications with students, than are faculty advisors. The computed *t*-value for genuineness is 2.7033 which is significant at the .0077 level.

4. Counselors are not significantly more knowledgeable about academic and vocational matters than are faculty advisors. Students perceived counselors to be more knowledgeable; however, the difference was not significant at the .05 level. The computed *t*-value of 1.1059 was significant at the .2706 level.

5. Counselors are more approachable by students than are faculty advisors. Students are less hesitant to approach a counselor for assistance then they are a faculty advisor. The *t*-value for Approachability was computed at 2.5692 which was significant at the .0112 level.

6. Counselors are more effective in meeting the needs of students relative to their advisement needs than are faculty advisors. The computed *t*-value is reported at 3.7227, which is significant at the .0003 level.

7. In general, counselors and advisors are most effective with the younger students. As students grow older they tend to be less positive toward counselors and advisors and tend to perceive they are receiving less assistance. The data revealed this to be true for all six variables plus the composite or overall analysis.

8. In general, there is very little or no difference between the perceptions of male and female students relative to the variables included in this study.

9. In general, those students who have grade-point averages of 2.0-2.6, or the average student, tend to provide higher ratings for counselors and advisors than do other categories. The high ability student, those with grade-point averages of 3.5 and above, follows the average student rather closely Those students with

grade-point averages of 1.9 and under consistently provide low ratings for counselors and advisors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations appear to be justified on the basis of this study:

1. Since this study indicates that, in general, counselors are perceived as being more effective in academic advisement than are faculty advisors, it is recommended that colleges utilize more trained counselors in their advisement programs.

2. Colleges should make greater efforts to provide adequate advisement programs for the younger, beginning student as this study reveals that at this stage they are in greater need of assistance and are more receptive to the efforts of advisement personnel.

3. In general, students perceived counselors as being more effective than faculty advisors; however, the ratings for counselor and advisor alike tended to be only slightly above mediocre. It is recommended that this study be replicated utilizing other methods of academic advisement such as "Trained Student Advisors" or "Specially Trained Full-Time Advisors".

4. Regardless of whether the person doing advisement is a counselor or a faculty advisor, it appears that the age of the advisee has some effect on the advisor-advisee relationship. It is recommended that a study be conducted that would determine if this "effect" due to age of the student, is because of changes that take place in the student or whether it is because of changes that take place in the person doing the advising.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Albert, Gerald. "A Survey of College Counseling Facilities," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1968, 540-543.

2. Alderson, L. A. "Junior College Counseling Needs," *Junior College Journal,* 1961, 32:100-103.

3. Anderson, Wayne. "Services Offered by College Counseling Centers," *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1970, 17:380-382.

4. Burck, Harman D. "Counseling College Freshmen: A Three-Year Follow-up," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 1969, 10:21-25.

5. DeVolder, John P. "Community College Students Define Counselor Role," *Educational Research Information Center,* 1969, ED 030 411.

6. Dilley, Josiah S. "Student-Faculty Noncommunication," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 1967, 8:282-285.

7. Donk, Leonard J. and Oetting, Eugene R. "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 1968, 9:400-403.

8. Duncan, D. B. "Multiple Range and Multiple F. Tests," *Biometrics,* 1955, 11:1-42.

9. Elliott, Earl S., Lindsay, Carl A., and Shockley, Vernon L. "Counseling Status and Academic Achievement of College Freshmen," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1968, 47:364-368.

10. Ferguson, George A. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education,* New York: McGraw Hill, Inc. 1969.

11. Fox, David J. *The Research Process in Education,* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

12. Gelso, Charles J. and Sims. David M. "Faculty Advising: The Problem of Assigning Students on the Basis of Intended Major," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 1968, 9:334-336.

13. Goodstein, Leonard D. and Grigg, Austin E. "Client Satisfaction, Counselors, and the Counseling Process," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1959, 38:19-24.

14. Grigg, A. E. and Goodstein, L. D. "The Use of Clients as Judges of the Counselors Performance," *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1957, 4:31-36.

15. Gross, Ruth B. "Role and Responsibilities of the Personal Counselor in a University Student Counseling Service," *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1968, 15:351-356.

16. Haase, Richard F. and Miller, C. Dean. "Comparison of Factor Analytic Studies of the Counseling Evaluation Inventor," *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1968, 15:363-368.

17. Hardee, Melvene D. "A program of In-Service Training for Teacher-Counselors," *Junior College Journal,* 20:453-459.

18. Hardee, Melvene D. *The Faculty in College Counseling,* New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

19. Hardee, Melvene D. "Faculty Advising in Contemporary Higher Education," *Educational Record,* 1961, 42:112-116.

20. Harvey, James. "The Counseling Approach at Harper College," *Junior College Journal,* 38:38-40.

21. Hopke, William E. (Ed.). *Dictionary of Personnel and Guidance Terms,* Chicago: J. G. Ferguson Publishing Co., 1968.

22. Isard, E. S. and Sherwood, E. J. "Counselor Behavior and Counselor Expectations," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1964, 42:920-921.

23. Jamrich, J. "Organizational Practices in Student-Faculty Counseling Programs in Small Colleges," *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 1955, 41:36-40.

24. Jones, Twyman. "The Counselor and His Role," *Junior College Journal,* 1970, 40:10-14.

25. Koile, Earl A. and Bird, Dorothy. "Preferences for Counselor Help on Freshman Problems," *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1956, 3:97-106.

26. Kranes, J. E. "University Teacher-Advisement of the Young Undergraduate," *Journal of Educational Sociology,* 1960, 33:335-338.

27. Kuhl, Edward C., Jr. "Do We Make A Difference?" *Educational Research Information Center,* 1969, Ed. 031 731.

28. Linden, James D., Stone, Shelley C. and Shertzer, Bruce. "Development and Evaluation of an Inventory for Rating Counseling," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1965, 44:267-276.

29. Meskill, Victor P. and Sheffield, Wesley. "In The Field," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1970, 49:55-58.

30. Moorehead, C. G., and Johnson, J. C. "Some Effects of a Faculty Advising Program," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1964, 43:139-144.

31. Myers, K. E. "College Freshman: A Faculty Responsibility," *Improving College and University Teaching,* 1964, 12:9-10.

32. Patterson, C. H. "Client Expectations and Social Conditioning," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1958, 37:136-138.

33. Pearce, Frank C. "A Study of Pre-Registration Counseling," *Educational Research Information Center,* 1967, Ed. 017 231.

34. Robertson, J. R. "Academic Advising in Colleges and Universities--Its Present State and Present Problems," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1967, 46:160-164.

35. Rossman, Jack E. "Experimental Study of Faculty Advising," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1967, 46:160-164.

36. Rossman, Jack E. "Released Time For Faculty Advising: The Impact Upon Freshmen," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 47:358-363.

37. Sensor, Phyllis. "Analysis of Student Reactions to Counseling," *Educational Research Information Center,* 1962, Ed. 014 287.

38. Shoben, E. J. "Some Problems in Establishing Criteria of Effectiveness," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1953, 31:287-294.

39. Shumake, G. Franklin and Oelke, Merrit C. "Counselor Function Inventory," *The School Counselor,* 1967, 15:130-133.

40. Tyler, Leona E. *The Work of The Counselor,* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

41. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (DHEW). "Client-Counselor Compatibility and the Effectiveness of Counseling," *Educational Research Information Center,* 1968, Ed. 019 687.

42. Warman, Roy E. "The Counseling Role of College and University Counseling Centers," *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1963, 231-238.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE DATA–GATHERING INSTRUMENT

EXPLANATION OF SURVEY ITEMS

The six variables treated in this survey are measured by the following items:

Knowledge	-	Items 1 and 7
Concern	-	Items 2 and 8
Approachability	-	Items 3 and 9
Genuineness	-	Items 4 and 10
Acceptance	-	Items 5 and 11
Gen. Effectiveness	-	Items 6 and 12

FORM A

SURVEY CONCERNING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Please provide the following information:

A. Age To Nearest Birthday (check one)
_____ 18-19
_____ 20-21
_____ 22 and over

B. Sex (check one)
_____ Male
_____ Female

C. Grade Point Average (check one)
_____ 3.5 and over
_____ 2.7 - 3.4
_____ 2.0 - 2.6
_____ 1.9 and under

Directions

You are asked to place yourself in the role or situation described in the questions below and then respond to each based upon your experiences in college.

Avoid comparing your experiences with the faculty advisor and the professional counselor, respond to each as two separate experiences.

Respond to each of the statements with one of the following categories:

Large Amount or High Degree	Considerable Amount or Fairly High Degree	Moderate Amount or Average Degree	Small Amount or Low Degree	Very Little or None
5	4	3	2	1

Sample:

You are having financial difficulties and discuss your problem with your Advisor/Counselor.

How much concern would be exhibited by your:

4 A. Advisor

3 B. Counselor

This response would indicate that you perceived your advisor as having a considerable amount of concern for your problem and that you perceived your counselor as having a moderate amount of concern for your problem.

FORM A

High Degree	Fairly High Degree	Average Degree	Low Degree	None
5	4	3	2	1

1. You go to your advisor/counselor with some questions about job entry requirements and the future of the vocation for which you are studying.

   What degree of assistance would you have received from your:

   _____ A. Advisor

   _____ B. Counselor

2. In an advisement session with your advisor/counselor you mention some very real personal situations which prevent you from carrying the required courses for the following semester.

   How much concern for your problem would be exhibited by your:

   _____ A. Counselor

   _____ B. Advisor

3. You have had the prescribed advisement interviews with your advisor/counselor but now you have some questions that are only indirectly related to your academic progress.

   How free would you feel to schedule another session with your:

   _____ A. Advisor

   _____ B. Counselor

4. During a session with your advisor/counselor he mentions that he is interested in assisting you in any way possible, that you should feel free to come to him at any time.

   What degree of genuineness would you perceive this response to possess if made by your:

   _____ A. Counselor

   _____ B. Advisor

5. During a session with your advisor/counselor the discussion touches on a very controversial issue. You quite openly respond in a very atypical and anti-establishment manner.

   What degree of acceptance of you and your attitude would you experience from your:

   _____ A. Advisor

   _____ B. Counselor

FORM A

High Degree	Fairly High Degree	Average Degree	Low Degree	None
5	4	3	2	1

6. You are an undergraduate with typical kinds of questions and problems related to curriculun and course selection, scheduling problems, job entry requirements, etc.

   How much assistance with these questions and problems would you receive from your:

   _____ A. Counselor

   _____ B. Advisor

7. Helped me to know what courses are required to reach my objective.

   _____ A. Advisor

   _____ B. Counselor

8. Was concerned about me and my success in college.

   _____ A. Counselor

   _____ B. Advisor

9. Made me feel comfortable and at ease even in casual meeting on campus.

   _____ A. Advisor

   _____ B. Counselor

10. Made me feel that he really wanted to be of assistance to me.

    _____ A. Counselor

    _____ B. Advisor

11. Tended to be patient with me when I was slow to make a decision or changed my mind.

    _____ A. Advisor

    _____ B. Counselor

12. Played an important role in my success in college.

    _____ A. Counselor

    _____ B. Advisor

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE 57th and Merriam Drive • Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66203 • Phone AC 913 236-4500

ONE OF THE MAJOR CONCERNS OF COLLEGES TODAY IS HOW TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT FOR STUDENTS. I HAVE TAKEN THIS CONCERN OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT AS A TOPIC FOR A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION WHICH IS SPONSORED BY JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY IS TO MAKE A COMPARISON OF THE TWO MAJOR SYSTEMS OF ADVISEMENT: FACULTY ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT AND ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT BY PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS. I FEEL THAT THIS STUDY WILL PROVE HELPFUL IN KNOWING WHICH OF THESE SYSTEMS PROVIDE GREATER ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS.

AS A COLLEGE STUDENT, YOU HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPERIENCE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT FROM A FACULTY ADVISOR. IN THIS SURVEY I AM ASKING YOU TO RECORD SOME OF YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE EXPERIENCES YOU HAVE HAD. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU BE AS OBJECTIVE AS POSSIBLE, IGNORING BIASES YOU MAY HAVE ACQUIRED FROM LISTENING TO THE EXPERIENCES OF OTHERS.

I AM AWARE OF THE DEMANDS MADE ON YOUR TIME, THEREFORE THE QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED SO THAT IT CAN BE COMPLETED IN LESS THAN TEN MINUTES. THE QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN CODED WITH A NUMBER WHICH WILL BE USED ONLY TO FACILITATE A FOLLOW-UP OF UNRETURNED FORMS. ALL INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM RESPONDENTS FOR THIS STUDY WILL BE HELD IN CONFIDENCE.

A STAMPED-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE IN RETURNING THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE. IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL IF YOU WOULD COMPLETE AND RETURN THE FORM TO ME BY JULY 1, 1971.

I WILL CERTAINLY APPRECIATE YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE IN THIS PROJECT.

SINCERELY,

Joe B Shelton

JOE B. SHELTON

ENCLOSURES

MH

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW–UP LETTER

JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE 57th and Merriam Drive • Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66203 • Phone AC 913 236-4500

A FEW WEEKS AGO A SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE WAS MAILED TO YOU AND TO OTHER SELECTED STUDENTS CONCERNING YOUR EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY ADVISORS AND COUNSELORS. IF YOU RECEIVED THIS FORM, YOU WILL RECALL THAT THE INFORMATION REQUESTED IS TO BE USED IN A STUDY OF TWO METHODS OF PROVIDING ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT FOR STUDENTS.

THE RESPONSE TO DATE HAS BEEN MOST GRATIFYING. A LARGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS HAVE SHOWN INTEREST IN THE STUDY AND HAVE PROVIDED THEIR RESPONSE. HOWEVER, YOUR RESPONSE HAS NOT BEEN RECEIVED AND I FEEL IT WOULD ADD TO THE STUDY.

ANOTHER QUESTIONNAIRE AND SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR USE. I WOULD APPRECIATE VERY MUCH HEARING FROM YOU SO THAT I MAY INCLUDE YOUR RESPONSE IN THE STUDY.

IF YOU HAVE ALREADY RETURNED THE QUESTIONNAIRE PLEASE DISREGARD THIS LETTER.

SINCERELY,

Joe B. Shelton

JOE B. SHELTON

MH

APPENDIX D

CODING FORMAT FOR DATA CARDS

APPENDIX D

CODING FORMAT FOR DATA CARDS

VARIABLE	COLUMN	CODING SYSTEM
Counselor	1-2	0
Knowledge No. 1	3-4	Actual Rating
Concern No. 1	5-6	Actual Rating
Approachability No. 1	7-8	Actual Rating
Genuineness No. 1	9-10	Actual Rating
Acceptance No. 1	11-12	Actual Rating
Gen. Effectiveness No. 1	13-14	Actual Rating
Knowledge No. 2	15-16	Actual Rating
Concern No. 2	17-18	Actual Rating
Approachability No. 2	19-20	Actual Rating
Genuineness No. 2	21-22	Actual Rating
Acceptance No. 2	23-24	Actual Rating
Gen. Effectiveness No. 2	25-26	Actual Rating
Advisor	27-28	1
Knowledge No. 1	29-30	Actual Rating
Concern No. 1	31-32	Actual Rating
Approachability No. 1	33-34	Actual Rating
Genuineness No. 1	35-36	Actual Rating
Acceptance No. 1	37-38	Actual Rating
Gen. Effectiveness No. 1	39-40	Actual Rating
Knowledge No. 2	41-42	Actual Rating
Concern No. 2	43-44	Actual Rating
Approachability No. 2	45-46	Actual Rating
Genuineness No. 2	47-48	Actual Rating
Acceptance No. 2	49-50	Actual Rating

Gen. Effectiveness No. 2	51-52	Actual Rating
Age	60	1 thru 3
Sex	61	1 thru 2
Grade-Point Average	62	1 thru 4

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following eight questions constituted the points of focus for the interviews:

1. Are the students able to make distinctions between counselors and advisors?

2. How do sessions with counselors and advisors compare in relation to length and frequency?

3. How knowledgeable are the advisors and counselors about academic and vocational matters?

4. Are counselors and advisors interested in and concerned for the student?

5. Do counselors and advisors make the student feel free to schedule additional sessions or approach them for additional assistance?

6. Are advisors and counselors genuine in their efforts to assist the student?

7. Are advisors and counselors accepting of students in their indecisions, vacillations, and modern attitudes?

8. Do advisors and counselors provide the assistance that is needed by the students?